UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,428	10/02/2003	Gregory Richard Hintermeister	ROC920020161US1	8449

7590 02/06/2008

Grant A. Johnson
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER	
DISTEFANO, GREGORY A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
02/06/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/677,428	HINTERMEISTER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory A. DiStefano	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 November 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,11-13 and 22-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,11-13 and 22-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *02 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on 11/19/2007.

2. Claims 9, 10, and 14-20 have been cancelled and claims 1-8, 11-13, and 22-24 are currently pending.

Claim Objections

3. The previous objection to claim 22 is hereby withdrawn due to applicant's amendment filed 11/19/2007.

4. The previous objections to claims 9 and 10 are hereby withdrawn due to discovery of Hayes Jr. (US 6,205,476).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanchett (US 6,834,301), in view of Hayes, Jr. (US 6,205,476), hereinafter Hayes.

7. As per claim 1, Hanchett teaches the following:

detecting configurations associated with a plurality of instances of an executing application, wherein each configuration comprises a plurality of settings, (column 4, lines 29-32), i.e. once the network administrator successfully logs in via the management console 106, the management console 106 retrieves data from the directory server 102 via the network 110, (column 3, lines 56-58), i.e. the control store database contains control information such as configuration data applicable at the various end nodes;

receiving a setting selection from among the plurality of settings, (column 4, lines 35-44), i.e. the management console 106 may alternatively or additionally enable the network administrator to select a node such as an end node and display applications under management for the selected node. Examples of applications under management by the network management system 100 may include virus scanning software and/or any other software product. Additional information regarding a selected application under management may also be displayed. Any modifications to the control data may be made via the management console 106. The examiner interprets "a setting" to be synonymous with Hanchett's teaching of "control data", as Hanchett teaches in column 4, lines 45-52, control data may be "properties, tasks, and/or configuration of the application".;

determining an inheritance state for the selected setting, (column 4, line 66 – column 5, line 16), i.e. the network management system 100 utilizes the network directory such as one provided by an NDS or the LDAP directory 104 to provide a hierarchical network tree structure for inheriting control data such as control setting. Control settings may also be referred to as polices such as configuration values and scheduled tasks. In other words, the network directory provides a hierarchical network tree structure for inheriting control data down to the individual applications on local client devices. Inheritance generally refers to a hierarchy of properties and settings in which the setting closer to the object being managed by higher than the object itself in the hierarchy have a higher priority than those further away. Thus a task setting set high in the directory tree can be replaced by a closer/lower setting. This hierarch may be utilized to implement management by exception on the network in which the administrator may set general rules and then set more specific rules on a case-by-case basis. The examiner interprets this teaching of Hanchett to encompass applicant's claim in that the system or administrator can determine the inheritance state for a setting by determining the "level" in the hierarchical tree of the network;

displaying a graphical indication of the inheritance state of the selected setting, (column 4, lines 29-44), i.e. once the network administrator successfully logs in via the management console 106, the management console 106 retrieves data from the directory server 102 via the network 110. The management console 106 may display various retrieved data in a display. For example, the management console 106 may display details of the hierarchical network directory tree. The management console 106 may alternatively or additionally enable the network administrator to select a node such as an end node and display applications under management for the selected node. Examples of applications under management by the network management system 100 may include virus scanning software and/or any other software product. Additional information regarding a selected application under management may also be displayed. Any modifications to the control data may be made via the management console 106.

The examiner interprets this teaching of Hanchett to encompass applicant's claim in that Hanchett enables an administrator to display an overall hierarchy of the network, select a node, and display that nodes settings. Since the overall hierarchy and setting are displayed to the administrator and the position of that setting determines the settings inheritance state, an inheritance state of the setting is therefore displayed to the administrator.

However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach a method where a current value of the setting is displayed in a control type used by the managed application. Hayes teaches the following:

displaying a current value for the selected setting, (column 4, lines 53-60), i.e. the invention allows administrators to configure an end user application directly by effectively running the end user application while posing as a user or as a user group. An advantage of this invention is that the administrator can run user applications and see the same screens that a user sees. This aids the administrator in diagnosing user problems by running the user application in the context of a user with the user configuration in place, rather the administrator's configuration;

wherein the current value is displayed using a control type used by a managed application for the selected setting, (column 4, lines 53-60), i.e. the invention allows administrators to configure an end user application directly by effectively running the end user application while posing as a user or as a user group. An advantage of this invention is that the administrator can run user applications and see the same screens that a user sees. This aids the administrator in diagnosing user problems by running the user application in the context of a user with the user configuration in place, rather the administrator's configuration.

The examiner interprets this teaching of Hayes to encompass applicant's limitations in that as an administrator may directly configure an application in the same view an end user would see, the view would show the current configuration displayed using the same control types that the end user would see.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the network management method with the end user application management of Hayes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have made such modifications because both Hanchett and Hayes are analogous art in the field of managing applications over a network. Furthermore, as Hayes shows in Figs. 12, 13, and 15-24, there method incorporates a hierarchical tree to aid the administrator to navigate the different instances of an application. As Hanchett teaches in column 2, lines 10-30, their method utilizes "a hierarchical tree structure" which is similar to that of Hayes.

8. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over modified Hanchett as applied to claim 1 as described above, in view of Coulthard (US 2003/0222918).

9. Regarding claim 2, modified Hanchett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach the functionality of the graphical indication. Coulthard teaches the following:

the graphical indication of the inheritance state indicates at least one state chosen from the group consisting of: the selected setting is inherited by another setting, the selected setting is inheriting from another setting, *the selected setting is both inheriting from another setting and is being inherited by another setting, and the selected setting is not inheriting or being inherited,* (abstract), the widget presents a local or noninherited state which enables the widget to have an entry field with editing capability; alternatively, the widget offers an inherit state having a read-only entry field that displays a present input string. The examiner interprets this teaching of Coulthard to encompass applicant's claim in that Coulthard's widget displays to the user whether a value is inherited or is not inherited and is user defined.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified the network administration interface of Hanchett with the toggleable widget of Coulthard. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to have made such modifications because Coulthard describes their widget for toggling between an inherited value or a non inherited value (see abstract) and Hanchett's method of configuring and monitoring a network involves selectively inheriting settings through the hierarchical tree of a network (see abstract). Further motivation for such a modification may be found in Hanchett's teaching in column 5, lines 13-26, where Hanchett describes a method of allowing an administrator to change settings on a case by case basis such as allowing a setting to maintain an inherited value or setting a new value, thus overriding the inherited value. One of ordinary skill would have found benefit in modifying this process of Hanchett with the toggle of Coulthard in that Coulthard's widget allows a user to either maintain the inherited state or enter a user specified value, thus overriding the inherited state.

10. Claims 3-8, 11-13, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over modified Hanchett as applied to claim 1 as described above, in view of Minard (6,247,020).

11. Regarding claim 3, modified Hanchett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach the functionality of the graphical indication. Minard teaches the following:

the graphical indication of the inheritance state indicates at least one state chosen from the group (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53) *consisting of: the selected setting can inherit or be inherited* (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the network administration interface with the graphical indication of inheritance states of Minard. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have made such modifications because as Hanchett describes a method to configure, manage, and monitor a computer network, Hanchett does not explicitly define the actual interface of their system other than in column 4, lines 29-44, where Hanchett gives an example of a possible display method being displaying details of the hierarchical network directory tree, where an administrator may select specific nodes and change the settings of those nodes. Minard teaches such a hierarchical directory tree mode in column 12, lines 27-48. Thus, one skilled in the art would have found it to be obvious to have used the hierarchical tree method of Minard with the display of Hanchett. The examiner finds the reference of Minard to be proper in this case as Hanchett, which addresses a similar problem as the instant application, directly references a "hierarchical network directory tree". As Minard describes a similar "hierarchical directory tree", one skilled in the art would have found it obvious that the same functionality of Minard may have been applied to other hierarchically structured data, such as network topology, thus, Hanchett and Minard are analogous art in the field of displaying hierarchically structured data in a hierarchical tree.

12. Regarding claim 4, modified Hanchett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach the functionality of the graphical indication. Minard teaches the following:

displaying a graphical indication of the inheritance relationship between the selected setting (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53) *and at least one related setting* (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed).

13. Regarding claim 5, modified Hanchett teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach the functionality of the possible setting options. Minard teaches the following:

at least one related setting comprises a setting that is not currently in an inheritance relationship with the selected setting (column 12, lines 43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed and selected).

14. Regarding claim.6, modified Hanchett teaches the method of claim 4 as described above. However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach the functionality of the graphical indication. Minard teaches the following:

the graphical indication of the inheritance relationship (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53) *comprises an inheritance indicator* (column 12, lines 39-49 which describes that the user is shown an indicator which displays their selection and the its inheritance relationships).

15. Regarding claims 7 and 11, modified Hanchett teaches the method of claims 1 and 4 as described above. However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach changing an inheritance relationship. Minard teaches the following:

receiving a change inheritance relationship command (column 4, lines 28-32 which describes that the inheritance relationship can be applied via command-line or GUI) *and changing the inheritance relationship for the selected setting* (column 12, lines

43-47 which describes that the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed, selected, and changed).

16. Regarding claims 8 and 12, modified Hanchett teaches the method of claims 7 and 11 as described above. However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach changing an inheritance relationship. Minard further teaches the following:

determining whether changing the inheritance relationship for the selected setting will affect other settings (column 12, lines 43-49 which describes that the user can see and determine which relationships are formed and how these settings are inherited).

17. Regarding claim 13, modified Hanchett teaches the method of claim 12 as described above. Minard further teaches the following:

updating the other settings (column 12, lines 47-49 which describes that user can update or select among different settings).

18. Regarding claim 23 and 24, modified Hanchett teaches the methods of claims 8 and 13 as described above. Hanchett further teaches the following:

detecting the configurations comprises reading configuration files, (column 4, lines 29-32), i.e. once the network administrator successfully logs in via the management console 106, the management console 106 retrieves data from the directory server 102 via the network 110, (column 3, lines 56-58), i.e. the control store database contains control information such as configuration data applicable at the various end nodes;

and further comprising updating the configuration files, (column 4, lines 45-52), i.e. the agent 108 at each end node 104 may collect information regarding the applications under management and transmit the information to the directory server 102 via network 110 for storage such as in the control store database or a log. Control information utilized to control the properties, tasks, and/or configuration of the application.

19. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayes in view of Coulthard, and further in view of Minard.

1. As per claim 22, Hayes teaches the following:

data representing a plurality of executing instances of the application, (abstract), i.e. the system provides the capability of allowing an administrator to configure a user application by running the application directly in the context of a user or user group;

wherein the current value is displayed using a control type used by a managed application for the selected setting, (column 4, lines 53-60), i.e. the invention allows administrators to configure an end user application directly by effectively running the end user application while posing as a user or as a user group. An advantage of this invention is that the administrator can run user applications and see the same screens that a user sees. This aids the administrator in diagnosing user problems by running the user application in the context of a user with the user configuration in place, rather the administrator's configuration;

However, Hanchett does not explicitly teach a method of displaying a widget with the setting of an application. Coulthard teaches the following:

a control widget associated with a selected setting for one instance of the application, the control widget comprising an inheritance state indicator and a current value indicator, (abstract), i.e. a composite interface widget for toggle able entry fields that minimizes real estate and allows the entry field to toggle between a special kind of input that is either a predefined value or a value specified by the user. The widget presents a local or noninherited state which enables the widget to have an entry field with editing capability, alternatively, the widget offers an inherit state having a read-only entry field that displays a present input string. The examiner would like to further note that as Coulthard shows in Figs. 1a and 1b, the widget 122 is composted of an inheritance state indicator 124 and a current value indicator 126;

selecting the control widget associated with a desired setting for at least one of the plurality of instances of the application. As Coulthard teaches in paragraph [0024], the inheritance toggle 124 may be clicked and toggled by a user;

modifying the current value for the desired setting, (pg. 3, paragraph [0024]), i.e. when the arrow button 124 is clicked by the user, it toggles to local mode and points to the right as shown in Fig. 1b. The entry field 126 then becomes enabled and the user can enter a value that is specific to this field, which in the example of Figs. 1a and 1b, is a connection definition or user id;

modifying the inheritance state for the desired setting, (abstract), i.e. The widget presents a local or noninherited state which enables the widget to have an entry field with editing capability, alternatively, the widget offers an inherit state having a read-only entry field that displays a present input string.

The examiner would like to further clarify that upon the modification of Hayes in view of Hanchett an administrator of Hayes system may access a client application and set configurations using the toggleable widget of Coulthard.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the network administration interface of Hayes with the toggleable widget of Coulthard. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to have made such modifications because Hayes teaches of user profiles inheriting values as shown in Fig. 18 and corresponding column 19, line 49 – column 20, line 28, and Hanchett's method of configuring and monitoring a network involves selectively inheriting settings through the hierarchical tree of a network (see abstract). One of ordinary skill would have found benefit in modifying this process of Hanchett with the toggle of Coulthard in that Coulthard's widget allows a user to either maintain the inherited state or enter a user specified value, thus overriding the inherited state.

However neither Hayes nor Coulthard teach of a relationship indicator. Minard teaches the following:

an inheritance relationship indicator that indicates the inheritance relationship between the selected setting (figure 8A - 809; column 13, lines 51-53) *and at least one* *other setting.* As Minard teaches in column 12, lines 43-47, the user can see and determine which settings are to be inherited and how their relationships are formed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified the network administration interface of Hayes with the graphical indication of inheritance states of Minard. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have made such further modifications because Hayes teaches of inheriting values through profiles as taught in column 6, lines 42-45 and clearly shows that profiles may be organized into a hierarchical tree as seen in Figs. 15-19. Minard teaches such a hierarchical directory tree mode in column 12, lines 27-48. Thus, one skilled in the art would have found it to be obvious to have used the hierarchical tree method of Minard with the display of Hayes.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

-Kulkarni et al. (US 5,848,243), network topology management system through a database of managed network resources including logical topologies.

-Harsham et al. (US 6,041,347), computer system and computer implemented process for simultaneous configuration and monitoring of a computer network.

-Mitchell et al. (US 6,166,732), distributed object oriented multi-user domain with multimedia presentations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory A. DiStefano whose telephone number is (571)270-1644. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm Mon.-Thurs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571)272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GAD
2/4/2008

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100